

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henry, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,996,718) (hereafter 'Henry'). As will be shown below, Henry does not anticipate providing a password for an application as claimed in the present application. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 19-20 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully traverse each rejection individually below and request reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 19-20.

Claims 4, 11, and 18 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Challener, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,085,933) (hereafter 'Challener'). As will be shown below, neither Henry nor Challener, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a method, system, or computer program product for providing a password to an application as claimed in the present application. Claims 4, 11, and 18 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully traverse each rejection individually and request reconsideration of claims 4, 11, and 18.

Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Wu, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,085,997) (hereafter 'Wu'). As will be shown below, neither Henry nor Wu, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a method, system, or computer program product for providing a password to an application as claimed in the present application. Claims 7 and 14 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully traverse each rejection individually and request reconsideration of claims 7 and 14.

**Remarks Regarding Applicants' Information
Disclosure Statement, Dated September 25, 2003**

The Office Action advises that U.S. Publication No. 2001/0055388 A1 should be listed under "U.S. Patent Documents" instead of "Non Patent Literature" in Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement ('IDS'). Applicants have accordingly included with the Response a Supplemental IDS including U.S. Publication No. 2001/0055388 A1 under "U.S. Patent Documents." Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the IDS in this case.

Objections the Claims

The Office Action, apparently alluding to an antecedent basis issue, recommends replacing "the separate input," recited in claims 1, 8, and 15, with "a separate input." Applicants, however, upon examination of the original specification, note that what is enabled in Applicants' original specification is "a passkey event" rather than "a separate input event." The inclusion of "the separate input event" in claims 1, 8, and 15 was a clerical error, now corrected by amending claims 1, 8, and 15 to recite "the passkey event" rather than "the separate input event." Applicants submit that these amendments add no new matter to the present application, because "the passkey event" is fully enabled in Applicants' original specification. Applicant's original specification at page 14, lines 5-7, states, for example, "Figure 3 is a software architecture diagram illustrating an exemplary method of applying 212 a hashing algorithm 214 associated with the passkey event 210 to the same master password 204 to generate an application specific password 216." Applicant's original specification at page 15, lines 24-26, states, for a further example of enablement of "the passkey event," "In the method of Figure 3, applying 212 a hashing algorithm 214 associated with the passkey event 210 to the same master password 204 to generate an application specific password 216 includes ...". Applicant's original specification at page 16, lines 8-10, states, for yet another example of enablement of "the passkey event," "In the method of Figure 3, applying 212 a hashing algorithm 214 associated with the passkey event 210 to the master password 204 to generate an application specific password 216 includes ...". Applicants respectfully

submit that the amendments of claims 1, 8, and 15, cure the objections to claims 1, 8, and 15 and all claims depending from claims 1, 18, and 15. Applicants therefore, respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-20.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102 Over Henry

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Henry. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As explained in more detail below, Henry does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, and Henry therefore cannot be said to anticipate the claims of the present application within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claim 1 as currently amended recites:

1. A method for providing a password to an application, the method comprising:

receiving, from a user, a passkey event uniquely associated with one of a plurality of applications requiring a password;

receiving, from a user, a same master password for access to each of the plurality of applications;

applying a hashing algorithm associated with the ~~separate input~~ passkey event to the master password to generate an application specific password; and

submitting the application specific password to the application for access by the user.

**Henry Does Not Disclose Receiving, From A User,
A Passkey Event Uniquely Associated With One Of A
Plurality Of Applications Requiring A Password**

The Office Action takes the position that Henry at step 500 in figure 6, discloses the first element of claim 1: receiving, from a user, a passkey event uniquely associated with one of a plurality of applications requiring a password. Applicants respectfully note in response, however, that what Henry at step 500 in figure 6, in fact discloses is:

User makes an HTTP request to an e-commerce server to access account on this server.

That is, Henry at step 500 in figure 6, discloses an HTTP request to an e-commerce server to access the user's account on that server. Henry's HTTP request to an e-commerce server does not disclose receiving, from a user, a passkey event uniquely associated with one of a plurality of applications requiring a password as claimed in the present application. A passkey event as recited in the third element of claim 1, as currently amended, is associated with a hashing algorithm. Henry's HTTP request to an e-commerce server, however, is not associated with anything remotely resembling a hashing algorithm, and in fact, only returns an "enter user id" page to the user – not a hashing algorithm. Henry's HTTP request to an e-commerce server does not disclose, therefore, a passkey event as claimed in the present application and as such cannot be said to disclose receiving, from a user, a passkey event uniquely associated with one of a plurality of applications requiring a password. Because Henry does not disclose each and every element and limitation of Applicants' claims, Henry does not anticipate Applicants' claims, and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

**Henry Does Not Disclose Applying A Hashing
Algorithm Associated With The Passkey Event To The Master
Password To Generate An Application Specific Password**

The Office Action takes the position that Henry at the abstract, and column 4, lines 22-31, discloses the third element of claim 1 which, as currently amended, recites: applying

a hashing algorithm associated with the ~~separate input passkey~~ event to the master password to generate an application specific password. Applicants respectfully note in response, however, that what Henry at the abstract in fact discloses is:

A common password method is disclosed which provides both convenience and security assurance for users who have multiple accounts protected by passwords. According to the present invention, a user only needs to remember a common password to access any of the user's accounts. A designated password for each account is generated by a hash function of the common password and some account-dependent information. The hash value is calculated at the user's computer, and then submitted as a designated password to a server. Thus, each account is protected by the distinct designated password, and the common password is never revealed in an unauthorized manner.

And what Henry at column 4, lines 22-31, in fact discloses is:

The second step is to convert the output of a hash function, which is usually in binary form, into text form for use as a designated password. If an account allows Roman letters appear in the password, the Base64 [BASE64] algorithm is used, without ending '=' or '=' in case the total number of bits of a hash value is not a multiple of 24. If the account only accepts digits, such as a Personal Identification Number (PIN), every 3 bits is converted into a digit. In case the total number of bits of a hash value is not a multiple of 3, 1 bit '0' or 2 bits '00' are appended to the hash value before the conversion.

That is, Henry at the abstract, and at column 4, lines 22-31, discloses a designated password generated by a hash function and some account-dependent information. Henry's designated password generated by a hash function and some account-dependent information does not disclose applying a hashing algorithm associated with the passkey event to the master password to generate an application specific password as claimed in the present application. The hashing algorithm as claimed in the present application is associated with a passkey event. Henry does not disclose, however, at this reference point, or anywhere else in Henry, a passkey event as claimed in the present application and, as such, Henry cannot disclose a hashing algorithm associated with such a passkey event. Henry does not disclose therefore applying a hashing algorithm associated with

the passkey event to the master password to generate an application specific password as claimed in the present application. Because Henry does not disclose each and every element and limitation of Applicants' claims, Henry does not anticipate Applicants' claims, and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Over Henry In View Of Challenger**

Claims 4, 11, and 18 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Challenger. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the proposed combination of the references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of dependent claims 4, 11, and 18. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974). Dependent claims 4, 11, and 18 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 15 and include all the limitations of the independent claims from which they depend. In rejecting dependent claims 4, 11, and 18, the Office Action relies on Henry as disclosing each and every element of independent claims 1, 8, and 15. As shown above, Henry in fact does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Because Henry does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 8, and 15, the combination of Henry and Challenger cannot possibly disclose each and every element of dependent claims 4, 11, and 18. The proposed combination of Henry and Challenger, therefore, cannot establish a prima facie case of obviousness, and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Over Henry In View of Wu**

Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry in view of Wu. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the proposed combination of the references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of dependent claims 7 and 14. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974). Dependent claims 7 and 14 depend from independent claims 1 and 8 and include all the limitations of the independent claims from which they depend.

In rejecting dependent claims 7 and 14, the Office Action relies on Henry as disclosing each and every element of independent claims 1 and 8. As shown above, Henry in fact does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 8. Because Henry does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 8, the combination of Henry and Wu cannot possibly disclose each and every element of dependent claims 7 and 14. The proposed combination of Henry and Wu, therefore, cannot establish a prima facie case of obviousness, and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Relations Among Claims

Independent claims 8 and 15 are system and computer program product claims for providing a password to an application corresponding to independent method claim 1 that include “means for” and “means, recorded on [a] recording medium, for:” providing a password to an application. As explained above in detail, Henry does not disclose a method for providing a password to an application. Therefore, for the same reasons that Henry does not disclose a method for providing a password to an application, Henry also does not disclose systems and computer program products for providing a password to an application corresponding to independent claims 8 and 15. Independent claims 8 and 15 are therefore patentable and should be allowed.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 depend respectively from independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Each dependent claim includes all of the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends. Because Henry does not disclose each and every element of the independent claims, Henry does not disclose each and every element of the dependent claims of the present application. As such, claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 are also patentable and should be allowed.

Conclusion

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Henry. Henry does not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claims. Henry therefore does not anticipate Applicants' claims. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 19-20 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, and 19-20.

Claims 4, 11, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Henry in view of Challenger. The combination of Henry and Challenger does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claims. Claims 4, 11, and 18 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 4, 11, and 18.


Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Henry in view of Wu. The combination of Henry and Wu does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claims. Claims 7 and 14 are therefore patentable and should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 7 and 14.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 13, 2007

By:


John Biggers
Reg. No. 44,537
Biggers & Ohanian, LLP
P.O. Box 1469
Austin, Texas 78767-1469
Tel. (512) 472-9881
Fax (512) 472-9887
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS